

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES H. FISHER, No. 2:05-cv-00540-MCE-EFB P

Plaintiff,

ORDER

N. DIZON, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On February 25, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days from the date the findings and recommendations were served. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

¹ In his objections, plaintiff also requests an extension of time to file more detailed objections and the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff seeks time to file more detailed objections

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304,
2 this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire
3 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
4 proper analysis.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time is denied;
- 7 2. Plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel is denied;
- 8 3. The findings and recommendations filed February 25, 2009, are adopted in full;
- 9 4. Defendant Powers' April 29, 2008, motion for summary judgment is granted;
- 10 5. Judgment is entered in his favor; and,
- 11 6. The Clerk is directed to close the case.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 27, 2009



14
15 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22 because he has limited access to the law library, and thus access to a typewriter and photocopier.
23 He does not, however, state even in general terms what it is about the magistrate judge's findings
24 and recommendations that might be objectionable in addition to the objections he already makes.
25 Thus, he has failed to show good cause for an extension of time. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1).
26 Furthermore, he has failed to allege exceptional circumstances that would justify this court in
requesting counsel voluntarily to represent him. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); *Terrell v. Brewer*, 935
F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); *Wood v. Housewright*, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990).
Therefore, the court denies his request.